

REMARKS

At paragraphs 4-10 of the official action, claims 1 and 8 have been objected to for designated informalities. These claims have been amended herein in consideration of the Examiner's comments and suggestions in order to define the invention with greater particularity and definiteness. As amended, these claims are now submitted to define the invention with sufficient particularity to be patentable to Applicants.

Rejected claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 2 and 6 have been objected to for designated informalities. These dependent claims have been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments and suggestions to define the invention with greater particularity and definiteness. As amended herein, these claims are now submitted to define the invention with sufficient particularity to be patentable to Applicants.

Claims 5-7 have been objected to for designated informalities. These dependent claims have been amended herein in consideration of the Examiner's comments and suggestions to define the invention with greater particularity and definiteness. As amended, these claims are now submitted to define the invention with sufficient particularity to be patentable to Applicants.

Claims 1-3, 5-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctively claim the subject

matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed with reference to these claims as amended herein.

These claims have been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments and suggestions to define the invention with greater particularity. As amended, claims 1-3 and 5-8 are now submitted to define the invention with sufficient particularity and distinctiveness to be patentable to Applicants.

Claims 1-3 and 5-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2 as being incomplete for purported omission of essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. These claims have been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments and suggestions to define the invention with greater particularity. As amended herein, these claims are now submitted to define the invention with sufficient particularity and definiteness to be patentable to Applicants.

Allowability of claims 1-3 and 5-8, if amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2, is noted with appreciation. Applicants have endeavored to correct or otherwise resolve all bases for these rejections in order to condition this application for allowance. Claims 9-12 are being retained in this application, unexamined, pending receipt of a Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the Applicants regarding any remaining matter that may expedite favorable disposition of this application.

Favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Masakazu Kawai, et al.

Dated: 12/19/07

By: /Albert C. Smith/
Albert C. Smith, Reg. No.: 20,355
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7296
Fax.: (650) 938-5200